GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
ABSTRACT

PUBLIC SERVICES – Panchayat Raj & Rural Development Department - Allegations of irregularities in execution of the road work from Hindupur to Pilligundla (Rolla Mandal) of Ananthapur District against Sri B. Ramakrishna Reddy, the then EE, PR, PIU, Ananthapur and EE, PR, Penukonda (FAC) Ananthapur District - Disciplinary proceedings initiated – Further action dropped - Orders – Issued.

PANCHAYAT RAJ & RURAL DEVELOPMENT (VIG.II) DEPARTMENT

G.O.RT.No. 306 **Dated: 08-06-2020**

Read the following:-

1. General Administration Vigilance Report No.68 (464/V&E/E1/2011) dated:23-04-2014.
2. G.O.Rt.No.103, PR&RD (Vig.II) Dept., dt: 03.02.2015.
3. Written Statement of Defence of Sri B. Ramakrishna Reddy, the then EE, PR, PIU, Ananthapur and EE, PR, Penukonda (FAC) Ananthapur District and now retired dt:29-4-2015
4. G.O.Rt.No.815, PR&RD(Vig.II)Dept.,Dt:20-08-2015.
5. From Smt. K. Padmaja, Chief Engineer, PR, Lr.No.Enquiry Reports/Pilligundla Road/ATP Dt:29-01-2018.
6. Govt. Memo No.9085/Vig.II/2014-10, PR&RD (Vig.II) Dept., Dt:17-09-2018.
7. Representation of Sri B. Ramakrishna Reddy, EE, PR, PIU, Division, Ananthapur (Retd) Dt:22-10-2018.

<< >>

ORDER:

In the reference 2nd read above, the following charge was framed against Sri B. Ramakrishna Reddy, the then EE, PR, PIU, Ananthapur and EE, PR, Penukonda (FAC) Ananthapur District, under Rule 20 of A.P.C.S. (CC&A) Rules, 1991, on allegations of irregularities in execution of the road work from Hindupur to Pilligundla (Rolla Mandal) of Ananthapur District taken up by Panchayat Raj Engineering Department under PMGSY Phase-VI.

Charge: That the said Sri B. Ramakrishna Reddy, former Executive Engineer (PR), PIU, Anantapur and EE (FAC) Penukonda (Retd), has committed irregularities in execution of the road work from Hindupur to Pilligundla Via Kethepalli, Manuru, Y.B Halli, taken up under PMGSY Phase VI (Rolla Mandal). He has allowed payment for CC pavements 1/2 to 1/6 which were executed with substandard quality without proper verification and assessment of quality of work which is liable for rejection. Rejected value of work is Rs.8,82,372/-. He failed to discharge his legitimate duties and violated Rule 3 of APCS Conduct Rule, 1964.

2. In the reference 3rd read above, the charged officer has submitted his written statement of defence.

3. After examining the matter, in the reference 4th read above, Smt. K. Padmaja, Chief Engineer, Panchayat Raj was appointed as Enquiry Officer, for conducting detailed enquiry into the charges framed against Sri B. Ramakrishna Reddy, the then EE, PR, PIU, Ananthapur and EE, PR, Penukonda (FAC) Ananthapur District.

4. In the reference 5th read above, the Enquiry Officer has submitted her enquiry report, holding that the charge is not proved against charged officer. Government, after examining the said enquiry report, have decided to disagree with the findings of Enquiry Officer and accordingly communicated the following disagreement factors along with a copy of the enquiry report to charged officer, as required under Rule 21 (2) of APCS (CC&A)Rules, 1991 and he has directed to submit his representation on the enquiry report and the disagreement factors vide reference 6th read above.

Contd…2…

"A perusal of the enquiry report of Enquiry Officer indicates that the Enquiry Officer has not analysed and assessed the documentary evidence available on the record for the charged officer. She has not given any clear findings on charges in her report much less on each of the charge against the charged officer whether it is proved or not.

On the other hand, she has given general findings. Under points 1 and 4 of her findings, she stated that the deficiencies pointed out on the road by V&E were rectified by the Contractor at his own cost, that the results of QC tests conducted by the department officials subsequently were within permissible limits, and that an amount of Rs.13,53,090/- was recovered from the Contractor as per V&QC, Kadapa and V&E reports. Under points 5,6 and 7, enclosing the photos of the existing road after rectification, she reported that the road was made traffic worthy and handed over to R&B Department, in traffic worthy condition and they have certified the same. Points 2 and 3 of her findings are not relevant to the charges framed against the charged officer.

The above findings by the Enquiry Officer clearly indicate that the Enquiry Officer has not enquired into the charges i.e., alleged irregularities said to have been committed by the Charged Officer in allowing payment without proper verification and assessment of quality of works of CC pavements ½ to 1/6 which were executed with substandard quality and liable for rejection, the value of the work which is Rs.8,82,372/-. She has embarked herself onconsidering the aspect of rectification of the deficiencies pointed out by V&E and QC wing i.e., beyond the period under consideration for the Article of Charge and concluded that the charge is not proved based on the road worthy certificate issued by R&B on 13.9.2017. This conclusion has no logic in it.

5. In the reference 7th read above, the charged officer has submitted his representation on the enquiry report and the disagreement factors mentioned in the reference 6th read above, stating that he held additional charge of PIU Division, Penukonda 29 mandals) for only brief spell of 5 months in additional to the regular charge of PIU Division, Ananthapur (34 mandals). The CC road was already completed, recorded, check measured before taking additional charge by him and he received the CC IV & part bill. Due to multifold work load of entire district, it is practically difficult task to anyone for verifying all the works. So, he had arranged payment to the contractor after verification of the quality control test reports by the field staff which are confirming to the strength requirements, duly withholding Rs.3.00 lakhs for want of QC test results. The defects which were pointed out by the V&E department were rectified by the contractor at his own cost and the road was made traffic worthy and subsequently handed over to R&B department in good condition and there is no financial loss to Government exchequer. And hence, requested to drop the charges against him duly exonerating him as he was already retired from the service.

6. Government, after examining the matter and the explanation submitted by Sri B. Ramakrishna Reddy, the then EE, Penukonda (now retired), keeping in view of findings of Inquiring Authority, have observed that the Charged Officer is responsible for inspection of 30% of total work, and was in FAC of the post for a brief spell of 5 months only, and the rejected value of payment is Rs.8,82,372/- i.e., 5.7% only against the payment of Rs.1,54,55,280/-, hence it is decided to consider and drop further action against him.

Contd…..3….

7. Accordingly, Government, hereby drop further action against Sri B. Ramakrishna Reddy, the then EE, Penukonda (now retired) in this matter.

8. The Engineer-in-Chief, Panchayat Raj, Vijayawada shall take further action in the matter, accordingly.

(BY ORDER AND IN THE NAME OF THE GOVERNOR OF ANDHRA PRADESH)

GOPAL KRISHNA DWIVEDI,
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT.

To
Sri B. Ramakrishna Reddy, K. Kondaiah, the then EE, PR, Penukonda, Anantapur District (through the Engineer-in-Chief, Panchayat Raj, Vijayawada.
The Engineer-in-Chief, Panchayat Raj, Vijayawada.
(with a request to serve and furnish the dated acknowledgement immediately)
Copy to:
The Secretary to VC., A.P.Vigilance Commission, Velagapudi.
The General Administration (V&E) Dept., PNB stand, Vijayawada.
(w.r.t. No.68 (464/V&E/E1/2011) dated:23-04-2014)
The PR&RD (Estt.I) Dept.
SF/SC

//FORWARDED::BY ORDER//

SECTION OFFICER